

## ***REMARKS***

By this paper, claims 31-41, 50, 52-55, 60-68, 76, and 77 are amended, no claims are added, and claims 70-75 are cancelled without prejudice and without disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 31-41, 50, 52-55, 60-68, 76, and 77 are all of the pending claims. Support for the amendments presented above is provided throughout the specification and claims as originally filed. Applicants expressly reserve the right to prosecute the subject matter of the unamended and/or cancelled claims, or any other subject matter supported by the Specification, in one or more continuation applications. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all the pending claims is anticipated.

### ***Examiner Interview***

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy shown to Applicants' representative in the telephonic Examiner Interview conducted July 16, 2009. Although no agreement was reached with respect to the patentability of the claims, the amendments presented above and the Remarks provided below are based on the discussion that transpired during the Interview, and are meant to embody the claim language and arguments that the Examiner preliminarily, but not formally, indicated appeared to be persuasive.

### ***Specification***

The specification has been objected to for a variety of alleged informalities. Applicants traverse these objections for at least the reasons presented below.

The Examiner alleges that the specification includes embedded hyperlinks, and refers to § 608.01 of the MPEP as providing grounds for the objection. Section 608.01 of the MPEP indicates that it is improper to attempt to incorporate information into a patent application by reference through an active, browser-executable hyperlink. The supposed URLs objected to by the Examiner are all exemplary, and are not executable by a browser at least because they include ellipses (...). Further, from the context of these URLs, it is clear that they are being provided merely as examples, and not as

attempts to incorporate linked subject matter into the specification. For at least this reason, the objection to the specification for allegedly including embedded hyperlinks or other browser-executable code should be withdrawn.

The Examiner alleges that the specification includes one or more instances where the acronym NIM (used consistently through out the specification) is misspelled as "NUM." Applicants have perused the specification, but have been unable to locate this typo(s). In the absence of more specific direction from the Examiner, Applicants request that this objection be withdrawn.

The Examiner has objected to the specification for several additional informalities. However, in light of the amendments to the specification and claims presented above, these objections are believed to be moot.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1***

Claims 31-41, 50, 52-55, 60-68, 76, and 77 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Without acknowledging the propriety of these rejections, Applicants have amended the claims to clarify the features of these claims, and the basis for written description support of such claims in the specification. As such, the rejection of claims 31-41, 50, 52-55, 60-68, 76, and 77 under § 112, first paragraph, for allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement should be withdrawn.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2***

Claims 31-41, 50, 52-55, 60-68, 76, and 77 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite. Without acknowledging the propriety of these rejections, Applicants have amended the claims to clarify the features of these claims in a manner that obviates these rejections. As such, the rejection of claims 31-41, 50, 52-55, 60-68, 76, and 77 under § 112, second paragraph, for allegedly being unclear should be withdrawn.

***Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 31-36, 39-41, 50, 52-55, 60, 61, 62-65, 68, 76, and 77 currently stand

rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,838,906 to Doyle et al. ("Doyle"). Without acknowledging the propriety of this rejection, Applicants have amended the claims to clarify various differences between the features of the claimed invention and Doyle.

For example, independent claims 31, 50, and 76 recite *inter alia* the following features, which are not disclosed in the sections of Doyle cited in the Office Action:

...wherein the visual manifestation of the first Internet content is displayed independently from any window of a dedicated Web browser program having native web navigation control features, and wherein if the graphical user interface rendered via the first home application provides any control to a user of the first computing device over access, via the first home application, to content obtained over the Internet from any uniform resource locators other than the initial uniform resource locators, such control is provided by features of the graphical user interface that are defined by content received by the first home application over the Internet in a format readable by a dedicated Web browser program having native web navigation control features.

Independent claim 62 recites *inter alia* the following features, which are not disclosed in the sections of Doyle cited in the Office Action:

...wherein the visual manifestation of the first Internet content and the one or more selectable options included in the graphical user interface are displayed independently from any window of a dedicated Web browser program having native web browsing control features, wherein all of the selectable options included in the graphical user interface that correspond to functionality available to the user via the home application are defined by the first Internet content received by the home application from the initial uniform resource locators over the Internet....

The sections of Doyle relied on in the Office Action disclose that a web browser being executed on a client computer can invoke a separate client application on the client computer to process objects embedded in web pages [c. 9, ll. 45]. The object(s) processed by the separate client are then displayed in the view rendered by the web browser [c. 9, l. 67-c. 10, l. 15]. Although the separate client application is in communication with the web browser, the sections of Doyle cited in the Office Action do not disclose that the separate client application provides a user with the ability to direct the web browser or the separate client application to other URLs. Therefore, the

portions of Doyle relied on in the Office Action do not disclose “wherein the visual manifestation of the first Internet content is displayed independently from any window of a dedicated Web browser program having native web navigation control features” and/or that “if the graphical user interface... provides any control to a user of the first computing device over access... to content obtained over the Internet from any uniform resource locators other than the initial uniform resource locators, such control is provided by features of the graphical user interface that are defined by content received... over the Internet.” For at least this reason the rejection of independent claims 31, 50, 62, and 76 based on the cited sections of Doyle should be withdrawn.

Claims 32-36, 39-41, 52-55, 60, 61, 63-65, 68, and 77 depend from a corresponding one of claims 31, 50, 62, or 76. As such, the rejection of claims 32-36, 39-41, 52-55, 60, 61, 63-65, 68, and 77 based on the cited sections of Doyle should be withdrawn due to the dependency of these claims, as well as for the features that they recite individually.

#### ***Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 37, 38, 66, and 67 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Doyle in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,292,185 to Ko (“Ko”). Applicants traverse this rejection on the grounds that the cited sections of Doyle and Ko do not teach or suggest all of the features of the claimed invention.

For example, claims 37, 38, 66, and 67 depend from a corresponding one of claims 31 or 62. The sections of Ko cited in the Office Action do not address the deficiencies of Doyle with respect to claims 31 and 62 set forth above. As such, the rejection of claims 37, 38, 66, and 67 based on the proposed combination of Doyle and Ko should be withdrawn due to the dependency of these claims, as well as for the features that they recite individually.

#### ***CONCLUSION***

Having addressed each of the foregoing objections and rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance.

Notice to that effect is anticipated.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Date: July 27, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By:

D. Benjamin Esplin

D. Benjamin Esplin  
Reg. No. 58,297

Customer No. 00909

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP  
1650 Tysons Boulevard  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
619-234-5000